

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
Eastern District of Michigan

United States of America

v.

RAAD MARCOS

Defendant

Case No. 23-20090

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Upon the

- ☒ Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or
☐ Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

- ☐ **A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2)** (*previous violator*): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community because the following conditions have been met:
- ☐ (1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):
- ☐ (a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; **or**
 - ☐ (b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; **or**
 - ☐ (c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); **or**
 - ☐ (d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; **or**
 - ☐ (e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:
 - (i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921);
 - (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; **and**
- ☐ (2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed; **and**
- ☐ (3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; **and**
- ☐ (4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

☒ **B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3)** (*narcotics, firearm, other offenses*): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:

- ☒ (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508);
- ☐ (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
- ☐ (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
- ☐ (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; **or**
- ☐ (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.

☒ **C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above**

☐ The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above.

OR

☒ The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.

Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention

After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:

- ☒ By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.
- ☒ By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.

In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:

- ☒ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong
- ☒ Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted
- ☒ Prior criminal history
- ☐ Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision
- ☐ History of violence or use of weapons
- ☐ History of alcohol or substance abuse
- ☐ Lack of stable employment
- ☐ Lack of stable residence
- ☐ Lack of financially responsible sureties
- ☐ Lack of significant community or family ties to this district

- ☐ Significant family or other ties outside the United States
☐ Lack of legal status in the United States
☒ Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration
☐ Prior failure to appear in court as ordered
☐ Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement
☐ Use of alias(es) or false documents
☐ Background information unknown or unverified
☐ Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release

OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:

Defendant Raad Marcos has been indicted in the Eastern District of Michigan for Conspiracy to Distribute and Possess with Intent to Distribute a Controlled Substance, and Attempted Possession of Cocaine with Intent to Distribute, in violation of 21 U.S.C. 846 and 841(a)(1). The government moved for Marcos' detention, and the Court held a detention hearing on February 22, 2023. For the detailed reasons stated on the record and below, detention is warranted.

The quantity and type of narcotics involved make this a "presumption" case. Marcos presented evidence to overcome the presumption - most notably that he successfully completed probation after serving an earlier drug trafficking sentence - but the fact of the presumption and the other salient factors favor detention. The nature and circumstances of the offenses charged strongly favor detention. In the fall of 2020, Marcos coordinated what he believed to be the purchase of 75 kg of cocaine for about \$2,000,000, though his "suppliers" were actually undercover agents. After arranging the deal, Marcos, who resides in Arizona, appeared in Detroit with armed guards and personally facilitated the presentation of \$300,000 as part of a \$500,000 cash down payment. Marcos' coordination of such a transaction is completely contrary to the picture Marcos paints of himself as a car wholesaler who earns \$3,000/month.

The evidence of Marcos being a danger and risk of non-appearance is strong, and largely dovetails with his history and characteristics. Prior to coordinating the sting transaction, Marcos had served more than four years in prison for two marijuana trafficking convictions. His first conviction was in 2004, on charges that he trafficked 45 kg of marijuana. Marcos appears to have caught a break and received 134 days in jail and three years probation, even being discharged early from probation in 2006. But Marcos did not stop trafficking drugs. He was convicted in 2009 for a similar crime, and received 30 months in custody. Marcos now appears to have moved on to large-scale cocaine trafficking. While Marcos is presumed innocent of the instant charges, the government proffered that they coordinated the 75 kg deal directly with Marcos, and they provided photos of him from the sting transaction, and a photo of the hundreds of thousands in cash brought as the down payment. Marcos was released from the scene, but still appears to have been undeterred; the government proffered evidence that in 2021 Marcos facilitated another large (15 kg) cocaine deal Oklahoma, and was observed moving \$124,000 in cash as part of the deal. Marcos has shown an ability to surround himself with massive amounts of cash, in various parts of the country. Should he be convicted, Marcos would be facing a stiff mandatory minimum sentence, and would also be subject to deportation to any country willing to accept him.

For all of these reasons, Marcos is a serious danger to the community and risk of non-appearance. Accordingly, detention is warranted.

Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Date: February 23, 2023



Judge's Signature

David R. Grand, U.S. Magistrate Judge

Name and Title